

Message

From: Fullagar, Jill [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=7BA061353C314B40A14A8BE1EE382AE3-GABLE, JILL]
Sent: 4/19/2017 4:34:19 PM
To: MERRICK Lesley [lesley.merrick@state.or.us]; URBANOWICZ Karla [karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us]; Hayslip, Gretchen [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=6a865037db6e44eb9d29f9aef00257fd-Hayslip, Gretchen]
CC: PILLSBURY Lori [lori.pillsbury@state.or.us]
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Hi Lesley,

Sorry if I was confusing. I think the rest of that section is fine. My concern is with stating that you will only look at data for which you have a listing methodology. I just want to make sure that statement doesn't create a legal problem of seeming to outright reject some "readily available data" that should be assessed. That's why I wanted to make sure there was a caveat for the narrative criteria, since you do need to evaluate for them, but do not necessarily have a methodology for how to interpret them. I thought you had a methodology for each of your numerics, which, from what Karla said, you do. My question then, was why is the sentence saying you will only evaluate where you had a methodology needed, if you do have one for all the numerics and would still need to evaluate the narratives anyway. It seems like an extraneous sentence then that could cause unnecessary scrutiny. I may be oversensitive though, so can ask an attorney about whether it would be a concern anyway. Thanks.

jill

Jill Fullagar, Impaired Waters Coordinator
Watershed Unit, Office of Water and Watersheds
US EPA, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (OWW-192)
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
(206) 553-2582, (206) 553-1280 (fax)
fullagar.jill@epa.gov

From: MERRICK Lesley [mailto:lesley.merrick@state.or.us]
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2017 8:11 AM
To: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>; 'MERRICK Lesley' <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

My intent for the available assessment methodology section was twofold. First, I wanted to provide folks a list of parameters which we can use in our 2018 assessment. Formatting data into the templates can be a big job. I thought it would be good to provide a list and potentially save folks some hassle for submitting data we have no way to use. Secondly, I wanted something to reference in the event we need reject data because there is no available methodology. Perhaps, the wording regarding assessment methodology should be changed to standards/criteria? Alternatively, if a list of parameters does not seem like a good idea, or could lead to problems down the road, I can remove this section.

Thanks!
Lesley

From: URBANOWICZ Karla [<mailto:karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 5:16 PM
To: 'Fullagar, Jill' <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>; 'MERRICK Lesley' <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

I don't think the call for data and data submittal requirements should specify anything about requiring a listing methodology, as I have commented before.

Or that there should be any implication that the data will be censored as non-representative when assembling data. Water quality standards DO apply in mixing zones for some parameters, such as bacteria, biocriteria, etc., and that is not a judgment made during the data assembly, storm event samples are relevant, and "normal conditions" don't get defined in the call for data.

From: Fullagar, Jill [<mailto:Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 2:54 PM
To: URBANOWICZ Karla; 'MERRICK Lesley'; Hayslip, Gretchen
Cc: PILLSBURY Lori
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Then why is that part in there? If you have a methodology for all the numerics, and a disclaimer would be put in for the narratives, then why mention that there has to be a listing methodology, if there either always is one or that doesn't apply?

Jill Fullagar, Impaired Waters Coordinator
Watershed Unit, Office of Water and Watersheds
US EPA, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (OWW-192)
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
(206) 553-2582, (206) 553-1280 (fax)
fullagar.jill@epa.gov

From: URBANOWICZ Karla [<mailto:karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 12:34 PM
To: 'MERRICK Lesley' <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

The water quality standards for some parameters have both numeric and narrative criteria. We generally have assessment methods for the numeric parts, but not for the narrative parts (toxic substances, bacteria, turbidity, some parts of the temperature and dissolved oxygen with criteria for certain uses states as "increase" or "reduction".

From: MERRICK Lesley [<mailto:lesley.merrick@state.or.us>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 12:17 PM
To: Fullagar, Jill; MERRICK Lesley; Hayslip, Gretchen
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla; PILLSBURY Lori
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Hi Jill,

I will check on this.

Thanks Again,
Lesley

From: Fullagar, Jill [<mailto:Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 18, 2017 9:47 AM
To: MERRICK Lesley <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Thanks Lesley. Are there any parameters for which you have a numeric criterion, but no methodology? Thx.

jill

Jill Fullagar, Impaired Waters Coordinator
Watershed Unit, Office of Water and Watersheds
US EPA, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (OWW-192)
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
(206) 553-2582, (206) 553-1280 (fax)
fullagar.jill@epa.gov

From: MERRICK Lesley [<mailto:lesley.merrick@state.or.us>]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 5:25 PM
To: Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>; MERRICK Lesley <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Thank you Jill! Perhaps to avoid any confusion, it would be best to add a sentence and a footnote to the table regarding parameters with a narrative criteria and no current methodology.

Thanks Again!
Lesley

From: Fullagar, Jill [<mailto:Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>]
Sent: Monday, April 17, 2017 10:58 AM
To: MERRICK Lesley <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Hi Lesley,

I had a few typographical edits/suggestions, and one more substantive one. Thx.

jill

Jill Fullagar, Impaired Waters Coordinator
Watershed Unit, Office of Water and Watersheds

US EPA, Region 10
1200 Sixth Avenue, Suite 900 (OWW-192)
Seattle, WA 98101-3140
(206) 553-2582, (206) 553-1280 (fax)
fullagar.jill@epa.gov

From: MERRICK Lesley [<mailto:lesley.merrick@state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 12, 2017 8:58 AM
To: Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>; MERRICK Lesley <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Thanks so Gretchen! I apologize for the typos is in the document. I accidentally sent the very first version. The content is the same, so I was able to incorporate your comments.

Jill, if you are able to review the document, please use the attached version. It incorporates Gretchen's review.

Thanks Again!
Lesley

From: Hayslip, Gretchen [<mailto:hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, April 11, 2017 3:46 PM
To: MERRICK Lesley <lesley.merrick@state.or.us>; Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: RE: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Hi Lesley, Here are my comments. Let me know if you have questions.

Gretchen Hayslip
USEPA Region 10
1200 Sixth Ave, Suite 900
Seattle, WA 98101

206-553-1685

From: MERRICK Lesley [<mailto:lesley.merrick@state.or.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 05, 2017 11:35 AM
To: Fullagar, Jill <Fullagar.Jill@epa.gov>; Hayslip, Gretchen <hayslip.gretchen@epa.gov>
Cc: URBANOWICZ Karla <karla.urbanowicz@state.or.us>; PILLSBURY Lori <lori.pillsbury@state.or.us>
Subject: Review of Call for Data Guidance Document

Hi Gretchen and Jill,

I have drafted a document for the public to outline our data requirements for the 2018 call for data. As we discussed in our call in January, the of the intent document is to clearly outline our data quality/meta-data requirements, and document why data may be rejected. I also added a quick checklist on the end. Thanks for the great suggestion! I am hoping you will have a chance to review the attached document and let me know if things need to be clarified or are too inclusive. I understand you both are likely very busy with the 2012 review. If at all possible, I would appreciate feedback by the week of 4/17. We would like to finalize this and move on to the next task ☺.

Thanks for your help!
Lesley

*Lesley Merrick
Water Quality Specialist
Laboratory and Environmental Assessment Program
Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Direct (503) 693-5724; Mainline (503) 693-5700*